HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor*

Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 16 Saturday, April 16, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section

Republican Defeat: It is not considered nice to mention Michigan around GOP National Headquarters in Washington today. As the statistics stand at present (subject to later recounts), the Democrats won 5 posts, while Republicans took only 3 in the elections for state offices in Michigan last week. The fact from which GOP leaders shrink is that, as the *New York Times* (April 10) put it: "Historically, Democrats have not come out in Michigan's spring elections. Until this year, they had not won any posts in spring voting for twenty-two years."

What is the cause of the defeat? Among a number of factors, one — the spending of substantial labor union funds for the Democrats — rivets attention. In the Capital, the money power of unionism looms as a national danger, not only in elections, but also in financial operations (witness the Montgomery Ward proxy fight.) Today, Washington displays great interest in one developing movement to provide a check on union power (for that story, see "Labor Front" item, below.)

Formosa Crisis: Less "war talk" in Washington this week, fewer predictions of an early attack by the Chinese Reds, although the buildup on the mainland continues. Ostensibly, Eisenhower remains firm in his established stand. But appeasement pressure on him goes on.

> **It is known that Paul Hoffman, "liberal" businessman, has not only been working on the President, but also sought to influence Secretary Dulles to give up Quemoy and Matsu. He got nowhere with Dulles. With the President, Hoffman (who played a big role in the Ike nomination fight in '52) added weight to the appeasement influence reportedly exerted by Dr. Milton Eisenhower.**

Stevenson's speech criticizing the Administration on Far East policy made but small impression here; he is not taken too seriously in the Capital. His attempt to shift the problem to the UN drew sarcastic comments.

One argument making headway here runs as follows: a decision to hold the islands in the Formosa Strait offers no more danger of war than did the successful Berlin Airlift in 1948. At that time, the Soviets — despite overwhelming forces — did not dare to attack Berlin.

Corsi Affair: The hullabaloo about Corsi, consultant on immigration, whom Dulles fired, is largely — hullabaloo, in the opinion of those who know both New York and Washington inside politics. Corsi long ago was classified as a "left-wing Republican" and the attack on his dismissal, naturally, is featured by the noisiest columnists and commentators who are leftists themselves.

As for his leadership among Italo-Americans, it is pointed out that he is regarded in that group as a "leftist." Anyway, experts on what are called "foreign language groups" say that the Italo-Americans have for many months been lost to the GOP as a result of the Republican failure to redeem its campaign promise to repudiate Yalta and its treatment of McCarthy. The cream of the jest, among circles that cover the State Department, is that Dulles apparently thought he was paying a favor to Dewey by naming Corsi (long associated with Dewey); the other day, in the midst of the hubbub, it was reported that Dewey definitely did not want a job for Corsi.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cain Affair: The oratory of former Senator Harry Cain about security regulations has brought this former "reactionary Republican" a new and strange audience of admirers — he has become the darling of the "liberals." Willard Edwards of the *Chicago Tribune* (April 12) after an interview with Cain reported, "Cain's speeches are attributed to political ambitions. He said he had no political plans, but conceded he had been sounded out concerning the 1956 race in his home state [Washington.] His term in his present job on the subversive activities control board expires in 1956, leaving him free to contest the seat of the Democratic incumbent, Senator Magnuson." Those who know the Northwest believe that the defeat of conservative Senator Cordon in Oregon by a "liberal" last fall indicated a drift to the Left in an area already prone to elect "liberals" and the lesson has been so drawn by all interested in advancing their political fortunes in the adjoining state of Washington.

Herald Tribune: Young Ogden Reid last week took over the reins of the New York *Herald Tribune* (from his mother who is retiring), and — say friends — will gradually transform it from a "liberal" to a "conservative" paper. Reid is described as conservative in economic and domestic matters; "pro-American" in foreign policy. It is noted that he immediately named Frank Taylor, formerly a Hearst man, as his right-hand executive. There are rumored other changes in staff.

Nixon: Vice President Nixon has acquired a publicity man — a development which spurs those who talk of him as Ike's successor in '56 to talk more along that line. The publicity man is a well-known former Washington newspaperman, Jack Beall. What is interesting — and surprising — is that Beall has a long record as an anti-Communist writer and radioman. For some years, he conducted a local program which sought to educate listeners to the dangers of the Communist conspiracy. He also is known as a critic of Yalta. Yet Ike's line is "let's forget Communism and Yalta." It is indeed a puzzler.

Labor Front: Conservatives in the Capital watch with warm interest the growth of a new movement which may serve as a check on the power of the labor bosses. The National Right to Work Committee, in a detailed economic study just issued, shows that economic gains in states which have adopted laws banning forced membership in unions have generally outstripped those in states permitting compulsory unionism. The "right to work" laws in force in 18 states protect the right of the worker to join, or not to join, a private organization in order to hold a job. Fred A. Hartley, Jr., co-author of the Taft-Hartley law, is President of the National Right to Work Committee.

The Committee staff examined economic indices in 12 states having such laws between 1947 and 1953 (six others have adopted such legislation, but too recently for the purposes of this economic study and comparison of figures.) Conclusions of the study show that the 12 states since 1947 have equalled or surpassed national average gains in non-farm employment, population growth, businesses in operation, retail sales, bank savings, construction, auto ownership, etc.

Man-days lost due to strikes or work stoppages in the 1947-53 period were reduced by 30 percent in the 12 states, compared with a decline of only 16.6 percent in other states. Non-farm jobs increased in the 12 states by 22 percent; by only 13½ percent in other states. The study offers refutation to CIO propaganda claiming that the "right to work" laws impede economic progress and have done harm to business in states with such legislation. (For copies of the study, write the National Right to Work Committee, 1001 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington 5, D.C.)

Squeezing Private Business: A startling example of government intervention in the field of business appears in the Hoover Commission report on the air transport services of the Defense Department.

The Military Air Transport Service (MATS) operates 536 aircraft (425 four-engine planes). In

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fiscal 1954 MATS cost the taxpayers nearly $500,000,000, numbered 103,268 employees and transported over two million passengers. Its routes parallel those of the regular commercial airlines of the nation both here and abroad. In addition to MATS' large passenger volume, the Hoover Commission found this government air service (already surfeited with planes) flying furniture and cement from Bermuda to the United States and transporting, about once a month, an Air Force Band from Massachusetts to Bermuda, so that "large open air dances and concerts could be held as morale boosters."

Additionally the Fleet Logistics Air Wings (FLOGWINGS) is a passenger and cargo service set up by the Navy. Its routes parallel to a "precise degree" those of MATS, although the latter is plagued with underloaded planes. FLOGWINGS operates 131 aircraft (98 four-engine planes), and is *planning a substantial expansion by 1957.*

The Air Material Command (LOGAIR) sponsored by the Air Force is at present an "all cargo airline", although it was originally created to distribute aircraft parts and accessories in "critically short supply," or aircraft parts having unit values of $500 or more. Air cargo is, of course, the most expensive way to move commodities and the Commission was apparently disturbed to find LOGAIR nonchalantly transporting "blank forms," publications, drawings, religious goods, athletic equipment, musical instruments, lumber, laundry and dry cleaning equipment."

Besides MATS and FLOGWINGS, the Defense Department uses what are called Administrative Aircraft (despite the fact that MATS and FLOGWINGS have plenty of unused seat capacity). It is estimated that Administrative Aircraft carried 1,255,000 passengers (mostly government personnel) within the continental U.S. in 1954.

The total volume of passenger traffic of the Defense Department's air services is estimated to have been almost *eight million passengers* in 1954. The classification of these passengers is particularly interesting. About 4.8 million are estimated to have been "hitchhikers" or persons with an "on leave status." A significant number of the total eight million represent persons who received from the Armed Services 6c a mile on travel orders and who pocketed this money by getting a free ride on a Defense Department plane, thereby making the government pay twice. Thus the Federal government maintains a huge passenger air service largely for the benefit of "hitchhikers" and persons clipping the Treasury.

Obviously, a drastic reduction in the passenger and cargo activities of the Pentagon's air services would save taxpayers millions of dollars. It would also turn back to private carriers (buses, railroads and airlines) considerable business. In the case of the commercial international airlines the taxpayers would be saved more millions. The Commission estimated that if MATS would relinquish only 25% of its present foreign passenger traffic and 50% of the mail it carries internationally, the total annual subsidy cost to Congress of the international airlines could be cut almost *eighty-eight percent.*

UN: A Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is touring the country claiming that it is trying to get "grass roots" opinion on a revision of the UN Charter. The Committee has held hearings in Atlanta and in Miami. On April 9, it was in San Francisco and in Denver on the 11th.

There are numerous protests about the manner in which the hearings are conducted by the Committee. These complaints come from well-informed and substantial citizens. They point out:

(1) Of seven members of the committee, *six* are ardent champions of the UN. Three members are actually on record as interested in world government. Thus Senator George, Chairman, has twice endorsed the Atlantic Union resolution in Congress. Senator Sparkman has supported three separate plans for world government. Senator Mansfield has endorsed the resolutions of both Atlantic Union and the World Federalists.

(2) The Committee, instead of trying to find out what the people think of the UN, is chiefly preoccupied with channeling its pro-UN philosophy to communities. Its members function to knock

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

down the testimony of hostile witnesses. The Committee requires 12 copies of testimony of witnesses 24 hours in advance of a hearing. Observers say, this is for a purpose of enabling pro-UN Committee members to needle and try to confuse adverse witnesses. Testimony previewed by the Committee and adjudged to be only an outright attack on the UN has been thrown out.

(3) Committee members become furious at the mention of Alger Hiss as one of the founding fathers of UN or the role played by Harry Dexter White in preparing its Charter. The truth is that a number of leftists including Hiss and White had a hand in preparing the Charter, but any witness citing such leftist influences is immediately subjected to gruelling cross-examination. Senator Alexander Smith constantly tries to confuse such witnesses by telling them from the bench that Senator George had a part in the writing of the UN Charter. Under the Constitution, the Senate has the vital task of passing on all treaties (the UN Charter was a treaty) and it is hard to believe that Senator George compromised his impartiality on such a matter by helping prepare a treaty on which, in his Constitutional capacity as a Senator, he would be called upon to render an impartial verdict.

Education Front: A shrewd and constructive move in the conflict over Federal Aid to Education has strengthened forces opposed to governmental intervention in the schools. Representative Errett P. Scrivner (Rep., Kansas) has offered a proposal to let states keep one percent of their Federal tax payments as school aid.

Scrivner says: "If you are looking for a simple, direct program for aid to education, free from government controls, without costly administration and devoid of any 'share of the wealth' attributes, the joint resolution I am introducing deserves your support." The tax allowance would be substantial in many states. It is calculated that the measure would give the state of Indiana, for instance, about $12 million to spend on its schools. This is based on the fact that in 1954, Federal tax payments from that state ran over $1,200,000,000. In the 48 states, Scrivner's bill would provide close to $600,000,000 school funds, based on 1954 Federal tax collections of over $58 billions.

The Kansas Congressman cites a precedent for his bill. It was established by "Public Law 630 of the 81st Congress, where it is provided that all of the taxes of incomes earned by American citizens in Guam, while resident there, including stateside Americans, both civilian and military, should be turned over to the government of Guam. Not just 1 percent, but all of the income taxes collected from Americans there — and Guam is merely an unincorporated territory."

Scrivner emphasizes that "there is a deep-seated fear that with government intervention in education programs, opportunity might well be found for channeling propaganda into our schools along with Federal controls which naturally follow Federal dollars from Washington."

It is noted that Federal aid advocates — such as the NEA — have not displayed any enthusiasm for the Scrivner proposal. Mrs. Frederick Ballweg, leader among anti-Federal-Aid elements in Indiana, raises the point: "If the NEA educators want no control, as they say, why have they not rushed to approve this bill?"

Letter from RAYMOND MOLEY, Contributing Editor, *Newsweek*: "In my work as a journalist it is essential to follow not only the newspapers but the news behind the news. For that purpose I find HUMAN EVENTS indispensable. It ought to have a million circulation."

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 16 HUMAN EVENTS April 16, 1955

Article Section

YALTA THEN AND NOW

By FREDA UTLEY

THE YALTA DOCUMENTS tell us nothing substantial that has not previously been revealed in the published memoirs of those who were there. No reader of HUMAN EVENTS will find much to surprise him, unless he required the published proof of the evidence, now available, concerning the cynicism and callous disregard of humanity and justice shown by Roosevelt and Churchill. Today the sickening details of the Great Betrayal of the Western world are less shocking than the reaction of our press and politicians to the long-withheld record of the goings on at Yalta.

In all the rivers of comment on both sides of the Atlantic, the central fact, from which all the evil flows, is generally ignored. Few have pointed out that the clue to Yalta is to be found in our abandonment of both Christian principles and common sense when we demanded "unconditional surrender." Yet there can be no doubt that had it not been for this cruel and stupid "war aim," formulated by Roosevelt at Casablanca, and accepted by Churchill with some reluctance, Stalin would have been unable to blackmail us at Teheran, Yalta or Potsdam.

It was because the leaders of the Western world had already ignored the Atlantic Charter that all the "blood, sweat and tears" were shed in vain. At Yalta we snatched defeat out of the jaws of victory because we had ourselves adopted the same war aims as the Nazis and the Communists: destruction and dismemberment of enemy nations and the enslavement of the vanquished.

Imitation being the sincerest form of flattery, Stalin must have been elated by the zeal with which his Western allies sought to emulate him both in the treatment of the vanquished, and in their disregard of the rights of small or weak nations, irrespective of whether they were friend or foe.

Right at the beginning of the Conference, Roosevelt showed himself in favor of a Katyn Forest type massacre when he expressed "the hope" that "Marshal Stalin would propose a toast to the execution of 50,000 officers of the German Army." And when the conferees got down to the business of discussing what should be done to the Germans after their coming defeat there was almost complete unanimity concerning the vengeful policies which were to be followed. All three agreed "in principle" to the dismemberment of Germany. There was only some argument between Churchill and Roosevelt as to whether Germany should be cut up into two or five or more parts. Next, the President of the United States pronounced it as "our objective" to help Soviet Russia "get all it can in manpower and factories" while also "helping the British to get all they can in exports

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to former German markets." It was further agreed that the German people should be permitted only a concentration camp diet—"no higher living standard than is required for prevention of disease and disorder."

IT IS DIFFICULT to see how Roosevelt or anyone else could have imagined that even an Asiatic colony's subsistence level of existence would have been feasible if the Yalta agreements had been fully implemented. For it was agreed:

(a) That Germany should be deprived of her territory east of the Oder-Neisse line and provide sustenance for the millions of her people who were to be expropriated and driven from their homes there and in the Sudetenland.

(b) That eighty percent of her industry was to be destroyed or carted off as war booty or reparations by the victors, and that the property of German subjects abroad was to be confiscated without compensation in true Bolshevik fashion.

(c) That she was to be required to pay "reparations in kind" for ten years, *and* to supply slave labor to her conquerors.

Our "liberal" President did not, it is true, openly advocate the mass liquidation by hunger of the conquered peoples which would have been inevitable under the Morgenthau Plan which he had already approved at Quebec. But he saw no inconsistency in his advocacy of the "Four Freedoms" and his expressed approval of slave labor for Germans. In the Bohlen minutes of the Conference we read that it was not Stalin, but Roosevelt, who said that "he would like to bring up the question of the Russian desires in regard to the utilization of German manpower as reparations."

Stalin, evidently surprised at the readiness of the American President to sanction the revival of the ancient practice of enslaving the conquered, replied that he was not yet ready "with a plan in regard to German manpower." Roosevelt thereupon remarked that "we" would "help the Soviet Union retain the reparations in kind which she required, as well as German manpower to reconstruct the devastated regions." Churchill, able as always to express his views in more lofty, or Aesopian language than Roosevelt, stated that the victors would "reserve all rights" over the "land, liberty and lives" of the vanquished. At another Yalta session, Churchill "improved" his formula to include "property and activities," in addition to "land and liberty," thus ensuring that a full pound of flesh would be cut out of the living body of the German culprit, who had no Portia to defend her.

Only the ghost of Genghis Khan was absent at Yalta.

Churchill differed from the Dictator of All the Russias and the near dictator of the United States, only in his appreciation of the fact that slaves cannot work well unless they are fed. In words which could not have been taken exception to by Hitler or Simon Legree, the Prime Minister remarked that "if you wished a horse to pull a wagon you would at least have to give it fodder." Stalin, whose practice was to replenish his supply of slave laborers as they died from overwork and hunger, showed that he understood, better than the "Statesmen" of the West, that a man can not be turned into a beast unless he is starved. Replying to Churchill, he remarked that "care should be taken to see that the horse did not turn around and kick you."

This chit-chat was typical of the level of the discussions at Yalta. The "Big Three" obviously had no regard whatsoever for justice, or human rights, or "the good opinion of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mankind," or for the ideals and hopes for which American and British, Polish and Chinese and other soldiers on our side, were still shedding their blood.

Both Roosevelt and Churchill were worried only lest they might lose votes back at home if their betrayal of our Polish allies became known. Roosevelt begged Stalin to let him save face by pleading that "there were six or seven million Poles in the United States," and that therefore "it would make it easier for me at home if the Soviet Government would give something to Poland." Churchill, in similar vein, said that although he himself "did not care much about Poles," he "must be able to say that the elections would be held in a fair way."

IN BETRAYING EVERYTHING America stood for and believed in, Roosevelt, like a dictator or absolute monarch, thought that he alone had the right to speak for his country. This is made clear in a dispatch, dated October 4, 1944, and addressed to Winston Churchill, concerning a projected meeting between the Prime Minister and Stalin. After saying that he had instructed Harriman to "participate as my observer, if agreeable to you and Uncle Joe," the President wrote:

> "Naturally Averell will not be in a position to commit the United States, I could not permit anyone to commit me in advance . . ."

It is evident that like Louis XIV, who said *"l'Etat, c'est moi,"* Roosevelt considered himself and the United States as synonymous.

The American people were effectively muzzled during the war. Roosevelt and his "liberal" adherents, who enjoyed a quasi-monopoly in the press and on the radio, were able to silence the critics of his disastrous policies. Otherwise the American people would have protested against the President's cruel "war aims."

The argument put forward by Roosevelt apologists to the effect that he was forced to make great concessions to Stalin at Teheran and Yalta in order to "win the war," and obviate the danger that Russia would make a separate peace with Germany, would have no substance if we had offered just and humane conditions of peace to our enemies. Had we not insisted upon "unconditional surrender" there is no doubt that Stalin, instead of compelling an all-too-willing Roosevelt to sacrifice Poland and China, together with the hopes of the world for a just and lasting peace, would have been forced to make concessions to us. His fear that the Germans would get rid of Hitler, and surrender to the Western Powers while continuing to fight to keep the Communist hordes out of their country, would have enabled us to dictate to Soviet Russia, instead of becoming what General Deane designated in the Yalta papers as "givers and supplicants."

SIMILARLY, WITH REGARD TO JAPAN, there would have been no need to bribe Stalin to enter the Pacific war at a price which entailed the subsequent conquest of China by the Communists, had we not refused to modify the "unconditional surrender" formula. Whether or not General MacArthur was in favor of Russian participation in the war against Japan, as stated in the *Forrestal Diaries,* or was opposed, as General Willoughby avers, there is little doubt that General Marshall, who was present at Yalta, was mainly responsible for advising Roosevelt to pay Stalin's exorbitant price for Russia's future entry into a war which was already almost won, and could easily have been terminated if we had not continued to demand Japan's unconditional surrender.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In an article I wrote for HUMAN EVENTS, published on October 17, 1951, I called attention to the testimony given before the McCarran Committee by Eugene Dooman, a retired State Department official who had been assistant to Undersecretary of State Joseph Grew, which points up General Marshall's role in prolonging the war against Japan. "Dooman," I wrote, "testified that General Marshall, in the spring of 1945, held up as 'premature' a statement which the Secretaries of State and War had approved, assuring the Japanese that their Emperor would not be deposed if they surrendered."

Forrestal's *Diaries* offer further proof that there were powerful influences in Washington which positively desired that Soviet Russia should reap advantages from the coming defeat of Japan, even though Germany had already surrendered. On page 73 of his published *Diaries,* Forrestal relates that Grew had told him, on July 6, 1945, that "he was afraid that the proposed message to the Japanese would be ditched on the way over [to the Potsdam Conference] by people who accompany the President — Bohlen among others — who reflect the view that we cannot afford to hold out any clarification to Japan which would be construed as a desire to get the Japanese war over with before Russia has an opportunity to enter."

Constantine Brown is the only columnist in Washington or New York who has called attention to the iniquity of our having agreed to allow the Soviet Union to use German and Japanese prisoners of war as slave laborers. The "totalitarian liberals," whose voice is still far stronger than that of our liberal conservatives, continue to defend the inequities sanctioned at Yalta. They have no word of regret for the folly and cruelty which led us to assist the Soviet Union to establish its tyranny over a large part of Europe and the whole of China. Elmer Davis, for instance, writes in his latest book, that unconditional surrender "made sense" in the last war, but should not be our aim if we ever go to war against the Communists. And he praises the Nuremberg trials, where we refused to take cognizance of any crimes "not committed in the interests of the Axis Powers," as:

> "An example graced with the approval not only of the strongest powers, but of some of the most civilized in the world."

James Reston, like the other believers in "real politik," thinks that it is sufficient answer to the critics of Roosevelt and his dirty deals to say that the President gave away nothing at Yalta, because Stalin was "in a position to take what he got anyway." Reston and his kind not only ignore the fact that had we not insisted on unconditional surrender this would not have been true.

They also fail to see that when we blessed Stalin's conquests we made it easy for him to suppress the forces of resistance to Communist aggression and tyranny by extinguishing the hope that America believes in liberty for others besides herself.

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25.
Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED